



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/207,945	12/09/1998	BINH NGUYEN	5577-115	7467

20792            7590            03/26/2002

MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC  
PO BOX 37428  
RALEIGH, NC 27627

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

HUYNH, THU V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/207,945	NGUYEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Thu V Huynh	Art Unit 2176	
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>			
<b>Period for Reply</b>			
<b>A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.</li> <li>- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).</li> <li>- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</li> </ul>			
<b>Status</b>			
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 January 2002</u> .			
2a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL.                    2b) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.			
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
<b>Disposition of Claims</b>			
4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-57</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.			
6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-57</u> is/are rejected.			
7) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.			
8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
<b>Application Papers</b>			
9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) <input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b) <input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11) <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) <input type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.			
12) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.			
<b>Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120</b>			
13) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) <input type="checkbox"/> All    b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some * c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of: 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____. 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.			
14) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) <input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.			
15) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.			
<b>Attachment(s)</b>			
1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .	
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .		6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .	

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request fpr Reconsideration filed on 01/08/2002; application filed on 12/09/1998.
2. Claims 1-57 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 9, 13, 20, 28, 32, 39, 47, and 51 are independent claims.
3. The rejection of claims 10, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Blumenau et al., US 6,108,637 filed 09/03/1996 have been withdraw as pursuant to the applicant's argument.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. **Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 20, 21, 26, 27, 39, 40, 45, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Blumenau et al., US 6,108,637 filed 09/03/1996.**

**Regarding independent claim 1,** Blumenau teaches the step of:

- storing a record of the user request within a web server log (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-36).

- generating the requested web page, wherein the generated web page includes a content object having a unique identifier associated therewith (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-36, col.12, lines 54-50, teaches upon receive a user request, the server generates the web page to the client computer by transferring a file representing the web page. Further, Blumenau teaches that the web page “can itself reference other files” which means that the web page must includes link object which has an unique identifier in order to reference to other file on an web page environment).
- serving the generated web page to the web client (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-36).
- appending the stored record of the user request with the unique identifier associated with the content object included within the generated web page (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-52, Blumenau teaches a web page “can itself reference other files” which implies that the web page must includes link object which has an unique identifier in order to reference to other file on an web page environment. Further Blumenau teaches that the log file stores user information and “an identification of the file requested” which makes it clear that the unique identifier of the link request is also stored in the log file).

**Regarding dependent claim 2,** which is dependent on claim 1, Blumenau teaches the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Blumenau discloses wherein the record of the request includes information that identifies the user (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-52, “address of the client computer”).

**Regarding dependent claim 7**, which is dependent on claim 1, Blumenau teaches the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Blumenau discloses the step of appending the stored record of the user request with a time stamp for a subsequent user request for a web page (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-52 ).

**Regarding dependent claim 8**, which is dependent on claim 7, Blumenau teach the limitations of claim 7 as explained above. Blumenau discloses the step of determining a length of time the user views the generated web page using the time stamp within the store record (Blumenau, col.13, lines 50-58).

**Claims 20, 21, 26, and 27** are for a computer system performing the method of claims 1, 2, 7, and 8, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

**Claims 39, 40, 45, and 46** are for a computer program performing the method of claims 1, 2, 7, and 8, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**7. Claims 1- 4, 6-17, 19-23, 25-36, 38-42, 44-55, 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

**as being unpatentable over Wodarz et al., US 5,999,912 filed 05/01/1997, in view of Blumenau et al., US 6,108,637 filed 09/03/1996.**

**Regarding independent claim 1,** Wodarz teaches the steps of:

- generating the requested web page, wherein the generated web page includes a content object having a unique identifier associated therewith (Wodarz, col.3, line 39 – col.4, line 12, teaches generating a web page includes many ad objects which have URLs associated therewith to reference to other web pages).
- serving the generated web page to the web client (Wodarz, col.3, line 39 – col.4, line 15).

However, Wodarz does not explicitly disclose the steps of storing a record of the user request within a web server log; appending the stored record of the user request with the unique identifier associated with the content object included within the generated web page. Blumenau discloses the steps of:

- storing a record of the user request within a web server log (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-36).
- appending the stored record of the user request with the unique identifier associated with the content object included within the generated web page (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-52, Blumenau teaches a web page “can itself reference

other files” which implies that the web page must includes link object which has an unique identifier in order to reference to other file on an web page environment. Further Blumenau teaches that the log file stores user information and “an identification of the file requested” which makes it clear that the unique identifier of the link request is also stored in the log file).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Wodarz and Blumenau to help the server to provide web pages which based on the user specific characteristics as Wodarz disclosed “selection of ads to provide to the user are based on user specific characteristic” (Wodarz, col.2, lines 7-13), since storing “a record of the user request within a web server log” and “unique identifier associated with the content object included within the generated web page” of Blumenau would have helped the server keep track of the user’s information and activity.

**Regarding dependent claim 2**, which is dependent on claim 1, Wodarz and Blumenau teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Blumenau discloses wherein the record of the request includes information that identifies the user (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-52). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Wodarz and Blumenau to help the server provide web pages which meet the user’s interest, since basing on user identifier, the server would be able to serve web pages to appropriate user’s needs as Wodarz disclosed at col.2, lines 7-13.

**Regarding dependent claim 3**, which is dependent on claim 1, Wodarz and Blumenau

teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Wodarz also discloses the method according to claim 1 wherein the step of generating the requested web page comprises the steps of:

- retrieving a layout template for the requested web page, wherein the layout template defines how content objects are displayed within the requested web page (Wodarz, col.1, lines 35-40).
- retrieving the content objects (Wodarz, col.1, lines 35-62).
- combining the content objects and the layout template to produce the requested web page (Wodarz, col.1, line 35 – col.2, line 6).

**Regarding dependent claim 4**, which is dependent on claim 3, Wodarz and Blumenau teach the limitation of claim 3 as explained above. Wodarz discloses the method according to claim 3 wherein the content object is selected from the group of image files, hyperlinks (col.3, lines 55-61). However, Wodarz does not explicitly disclose the content object is selected from the group of text files, audio files, and video file.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included that advertisement objects of Wodarz is selected from the group of text files, audio files, and video file, since it would have helped the generated web page more attractive to the user.

**Regarding dependent claim 6**, which is dependent on claim 1, Wodarz and Blumenau teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Wodarz also discloses the method according to claim 1 further comprising the step of a parser program using algorithms to select appropriate

ads (Wodarz, col.2, lines 7-14), which implies the step of analyzing a plurality of stored user request records to determine web content preferences of a user.

**Regarding dependent claim 7**, which is dependent on claim 1, Wodarz and Blumenau teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Blumenau discloses the step of appending the stored record of the user request with a time stamp for a subsequent user request for a web page (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-52).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Wodarz and Blumenau to help the server more accurately analyze the user's records to determine web content preferences of a user, since the more user's information a server captures, the better the quality of the statistics would have been.

**Regarding dependent claim 8**, which is dependent on claim 7, Wodarz and Blumenau teach the limitations of claim 7 as explained above. Blumenau discloses the step of determining a length of time the user views the generated web page using the time stamp within the store record (Blumenau, col.13, lines 50-58).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Wodarz, and Blumenau to provide more criteria for Wodarz's parser program to select ads to provide to the client, since the server knows what the users' interests are, based on how long the user spent to view the web page.

**Regarding independent claim 9**, Wodarz teaches the steps of:

- generating the requested web page, wherein the generated web page includes first and second content objects having respective unique first and second identifiers associated therewith (Wodarz, col.3, line 39 – col.4, line 12; and col.1, lines 35-52 teaches generating a web page includes many advertisement objects which have URLs respectively associated therewith to reference to other web pages).
- serving the generated web page to the web client (Wodarz, col.3, line 39 – col.4, line 15).
- retrieving a layout template for the requested web page, wherein the layout template defines how content objects are displayed within the requested web page (Wodarz, col.1, lines 35-40).
- retrieving the first and second content objects (Wodarz, col.1, lines 35-62, retrieve many advertisement objects).
- combining the first and second content objects and the layout template to produce the requested web page (Wodarz, col.1, line 35 – col.2, line 6, combining many advertisement objects and layout template to generate the requested web page).

However, Wodarz does not explicitly disclose the steps of storing a record of the user request within a web server log; appending the stored record of the user request with the unique identifiers associated with the content objects included within the generated web page. Blumenau discloses the steps of:

- storing a record of the user request within a web server log (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-36).

- appending the stored record of the user request with the unique identifiers associated with the content objects included within the generated web page (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-52, Blumenau teaches a web page “can itself reference other files” which implies that the web page must includes link object which has an unique identifier in order to reference to other file on an web page environment. Further Blumenau teaches that the log file stores user information and “an identification of the file requested” for each single file request which means that the unique identifier of the link request is also stored in the log file).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have recognized that the first and second identifiers of files requests (objects requests) must be added to the log file when the user requests such files.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Wodarz and Blumenau to help the server to provide web pages which have many content objects based on the user specific characteristics as Wodarz disclosed “selection of ads to provide to the user are based on user specific characteristic” (Wodarz, col.2, lines 7-13), since applying Blumenau’s appending user stored record with unique identifier into many Wodarz’s content objects would have helped the server keep track of the user’s information and activity.

**Regarding dependent claim 10,** claim 10 includes limitations of claim 2, and is rejected under the same rationale.

**Regarding dependent claim 11,** claim 11 includes limitations of claim 4, and is rejected under the same rationale.

**Regarding dependent claim 12,** claim 12 includes limitations of claim 6, and is rejected under the same rationale.

**Regarding independent claim 13,** Wodarz teaches the steps of:

- associating dynamically generated web page content with a user who requests a web page from a web server via a web client in communication with the web server (Wodarz, col.1, lines 35-52).

**Regarding dependent claim 14,** claim 14 includes limitations of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

**Regarding dependent claim 15,** claim 15 includes limitations of claim 2, and is rejected under the same rationale.

**Regarding dependent claim 16,** claim 16 includes limitations of claim 3, and is rejected under the same rationale.

**Regarding dependent claim 17,** claim 17 includes limitation of claim 4, and is rejected under the same rationale.

**Regarding dependent claim 19,** claim 19 includes limitation of claim 6, and is rejected under the same rationale.

**Claims 20-23, 25-36, and 38** are for a computer system performing the method of claims 1-4, 6-17, and 19, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

**Claims 39-42, 44-55, and 57** are for a computer program performing the method of claims 1-4, 6-17, and 19, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

8. **Claims 5, 18, 24, 37, 43, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wodarz in view of Blumenau as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Leighton et al., US 6,108,703 original filed 07/14/1998.**

**Regarding dependent claim 5,** which is dependent on claim 1, Wodarz and Blumenau teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Wodarz and Blumenau do not disclose the step of wherein the unique identifier associated with the content object is generated by a hashing function. Leighton discloses the step of URL associated with the content object is generated by a hashing function (col.4, lines 5-10). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Wodarz, Blumenau and Leighton to provide a highly unique identifier for the content object, since the hash function was well known for providing a unique identifier of a piece of data.

**Regarding dependent claim 18**, claim 18 includes limitation of claim 5, and is rejected under the same rationale.

**Claims 24 and 37** are for a computer system performing the method of claim 5, are rejected under the same rationale.

**Claims 43 and 56** are for a computer program performing the method of claim 5, are rejected under the same rationale.

#### *Response to Arguments*

9. Applicant's arguments filed on 01/08/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue claims 1, 9, and 13, which are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e)

- Applicant argues with respect to claim 1 that Blumenau does not suggest the step of “generating a requested Web page, wherein the generated Web page includes a content object having a unique identifier associated therewith and/or appending the stored record of the user request with the unique identifier associated with the content object include within the generated web page”

Examiner disagrees. Blumenau teaches a web page “can itself reference other files” (Blumenau, col.2, lines 20-27) which implies that the web page must includes link object which has an unique identifier in order to reference to other file on an web page environment.

Art Unit: 2176

Also see page 12, example 2, the content objects, such as image file “southwest.gif” which has a unique identifier URL. Further Blumenau teaches that the log file stores user information and “an identification of the file requested” (Blumenau, col.39-46) which makes it clear that the unique identifier of the link request is also stored in the log file.

- Applicant argues with respect to claim 9 that claim 10 is dependent on claim 9 and Blumenau fails to describe the limitations of claim 9.

Examiner agrees. Claim 10 has been withdrawn as pursuant to the applicant’s argument.

- Applicant argues with respect to claim 13 that claims 14 and 15 are dependent on claim 13 and Blumenau fails to describe the limitations of claim 13.

Examiner agrees. Claims 14 and 15 have been withdrawn as pursuant to the applicant’s argument.

Applicants argue claims 1, 9, and 13, which are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a)

- Applicant argues with respect to claim 1 that Blumenau does not teach or suggest “appending the stored record of the user request with the unique identifier associated with the content object included within the generated web page”.

Examiner disagrees. Blumenau teaches a web page “can itself reference other files” which implies that the web page must includes link object which has an unique identifier in order

to reference to other file on an web page environment. Further Blumenau teaches that the log file stores user information and “an identification of the file requested” which makes it clear that the unique identifier of the link request is also stored in the log file.

- Applicant argues with respect to claim 9 that Blumenau does not teach or suggest “appending the stored record of the user request with first and second identifiers associated with the first and second content objects included within the generated web page”.

Examiner disagrees. As explained above the step of “appending the stored record of the user request with the unique identifier associated with the content object included within the generated web page” is clearly disclosed by Blumenau. Further Blumenau teaches that the log file stores user information and identifier of the file request for each single file request. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have recognized that the first and second identifiers of files requests (objects requests) must be added to the log file when the user requests such files. It is noted that the limitations of claim 9 are combination of claims 1 and 3 for many content objects. It is also revised to ease the Applicants follow.

- Applicant argues with respect to claim 13 that Wodarz does not teach or suggest “associating dynamically generated Web page content with a user who requests a web page from a web server via a web client in communication with the web server”.

Examiner disagrees. Wodarz teaches that responding the user request, the web server dynamically generate the requested web page and provide the web page for the user which

clearly discloses the step associating dynamically generated web page with user who request a web page from a web server via web client in communication with the web server.

- Applicant argues claims 6, 12, and 19 that Wodarz does not teach or suggest “analyzing stored user request records”.

Examiner disagrees. Wodarz teaches dynamically generating web page is created based on time of day ... user specific characteristic ... the maximum number of times that an ad has been viewed (Wodarz, col.2, line 3-20) which clearly suggests the step of analyzing stored user request record to generate the content web page. Blumenau's stored user request records also include “time stamp[s] for the request[s]” (Blumenau, col.2, line 34-50, specifically line 47), as well as “web page hit[s]” (Blumenau, col.3, lines 25-26), and other information that are used when such analyses are needed. The combination of Wodarz and Blumenau will analyze stored user request records to augment the accuracy of service.

### *Conclusion*

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2176

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu v Huynh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, except the second Friday of each bi-week.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R Herndon can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications, and (703) 746-7240 for Non-Official/Draft.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9000.

TVH  
March 21, 2002

  
HEATHER R. HERNDON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100